

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2008-09**Clinton School District**

ALBERT A. COVIELLO, Superintendent
Telephone: (860) 664-6500

Location: 137-B Glenwood Circle
Clinton,
Connecticut

Website: www.clintonpublic.org

This profile was produced by the Connecticut State Department of Education in accordance with CT General Statutes 10-220(c) using data and narratives provided by the school district, testing services, or the US Census. Profiles and additional education data, including longitudinal data, are available on the internet at www.sde.ct.gov.

COMMUNITY DATA

County: Middlesex	Per Capita Income in 2000: \$26,080
Town Population in 2000: 13,094	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 8.4%
1990-2000 Population Growth: 2.6%	Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 1.1%
Number of Public Schools: 4	District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 94.7%

*To view the Adult Education Program Profiles online, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on Adult Education, then Reports.

District Reference Group (DRG): D DRG is a classification of districts whose students' families are similar in education, income, occupation, and need, and that have roughly similar enrollment. The Connecticut State Board of Education approved DRG classification for purposes of reporting data other than student performance.

STUDENT ENROLLMENT

Enrollment on October 1, 2008 2,084
5-Year Enrollment Change -3.7%

DISTRICT GRADE RANGE

Grade Range PK-12

INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED

Need Indicator	Number in District	Percent		
		District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	245	11.8	11.7	30.3
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	31	1.5	2.3	5.2
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	128	6.1	4.9	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	278	13.3	11.2	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	147	96.1	85.8	79.7
Homeless	0	0.0	0.1	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	85	27.0	22.8	19.0

*0.0% of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	2	0.1
Asian American	54	2.6
Black	22	1.1
Hispanic	134	6.4
White	1,872	89.8
Total Minority	212	10.2

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 0.9%

Non-English Home Language: 1.9% of this district's students (excluding prekindergarten students) come from homes where English is not the primary language. The number of non-English home languages is 6.

EFFORTS TO REDUCE RACIAL, ETHNIC, AND ECONOMIC ISOLATION

Below is the description submitted by this school of how it provides educational opportunities for its students to interact with students and teachers from diverse racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds.

The town of Clinton is fortunate that the community reflects racial, ethnic, and economic diversity. With nearly ten percent of our population being members of minority groups, our schools provide wonderful opportunities for students and the community-at-large to practice and experience an environment that is racially, ethnically, and economically diverse. Based on state data, none of the four minority racial/ethnic groups represented in our population is disproportionately represented in Special Education. In addition, the percentage of our Special Education students who spend time with non-disabled peers continues to improve and is on par when compared to both our DRG and the State percentages. The district is one of only 13 (10 if you don't count magnets and RESCs) districts statewide to have a K-12 World Languages Program. The program is designed to provide all students, kindergarten through grade 6, with the equivalent of a level one Spanish course. In 7th and 8th grade students complete the equivalent of level two, with the goal of having all students be able to begin high school at level three. In addition, beginning in grade 7, students may elect to switch to French. The district has also embraced the introduction of Chinese, considered a "Critical Language" by the U. S. Department of State, as a language elective at The Morgan School. The district hosted Chinese students and dignitaries and a group of students and teachers visited China in the spring. Clinton students continue to have an opportunity to participate in the inter-district magnet school in New Haven, and the regional technical school, and the vocational-agricultural school in Middletown. The district also received a grant to support early literacy and worked collaboratively with the regional adult education program (ERACE) to support English Language Learners (ELL) and their families. The programs were wildly successful with upwards of 60 participants. The Joel School again hosted several teachers-in-training from the University of Northern Switzerland for five weeks. Once again, nearly every student in the district was involved in at least one locally funded intradistrict program designed to reduce isolation, increase awareness of diversity of individuals and cultures, to reduce/eliminate harassment, and/or to respect others.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE

Connecticut Mastery Test, Fourth Generation, % Meeting State Goal. The Goal level is more demanding than the Proficient level, but not as high as the Advanced level, reported in the No Child Left Behind Report Cards.

Grade and CMT Subject Area	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Meeting Goal
Grade 3 Reading	54.6	54.6	32.7
Writing	71.2	62.5	56.6
Mathematics	62.1	62.8	34.6
Grade 4 Reading	67.6	60.7	48.5
Writing	69.1	64.2	43.6
Mathematics	62.2	63.6	32.3
Grade 5 Reading	82.0	66.0	74.5
Writing	75.9	66.5	58.6
Mathematics	74.5	68.8	48.1
Science	70.6	58.1	54.3
Grade 6 Reading	80.1	68.9	57.1
Writing	65.1	62.2	41.7
Mathematics	71.2	68.8	36.8
Grade 7 Reading	83.8	74.9	60.5
Writing	76.9	62.9	71.3
Mathematics	74.7	66.0	54.8
Grade 8 Reading	84.9	68.4	78.7
Writing	77.5	66.5	56.8
Mathematics	77.9	64.5	58.1
Science	70.6	60.6	45.8

These results reflect the performance of students with scoreable tests who were enrolled in the district at the time of testing, regardless of the length of time they were enrolled in the district. Results for fewer than 20 students are not presented.

For more detailed CMT results, go to www.ctreports.com.

To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on "No Child Left Behind."

Connecticut Academic Performance Test, Third Generation, % Meeting State Goal. The CAPT is administered to Grade 10 students. The Goal level is more demanding than the state Proficient level, but not as high as the Advanced level, reported in the No Child Left Behind Report Cards. The following results reflect the performance of students with scoreable tests who were enrolled in the school at the time of testing, regardless of the length of time they were enrolled in the school. Results for fewer than 20 students are not presented.

CAPT Subject Area	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Meeting Goal
Reading Across the Disciplines	60.8	47.4	65.9
Writing Across the Disciplines	66.7	55.0	60.3
Mathematics	50.7	47.8	44.3
Science	47.9	42.8	48.1

For more detailed CAPT results, go to www.ctreports.com.

To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on "No Child Left Behind."

Physical Fitness. The assessment includes tests for flexibility, abdominal strength and endurance, upper-body strength and aerobic endurance.

Physical Fitness: % of Students Reaching Health Standard on All Four Tests	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Reaching Standard
	29.4	36.2	28.4

SAT [®] I: Reasoning Test Class of 2008		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		70.3	74.5	
Average Score	Mathematics	523	507	66.7
	Critical Reading	521	503	64.3
	Writing	528	506	71.3

SAT[®] I. The lowest possible score on each SAT[®] I subtest is 200; the highest possible score is 800.

Graduation and Dropout Rates	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Less Desirable Rates
Graduation Rate, Class of 2008	92.8	92.1	35.9
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2008	5.6	6.6	40.9
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	3.4	2.5	12.4

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	80.0	84.1
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	15.5	11.0

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	150.13
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	9.79
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	26.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	41.18
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	6.40
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	3.50
School Level	7.40
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	3.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	12.00
School Nurses	3.72
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	83.21

In the full-time equivalent (FTE) count, staff members working part-time in the school district are counted as a fraction of full-time. For example, a teacher who works half-time in the district contributes 0.50 to the district's staff count.

Teachers and Instructors	District	DRG	State
Average Years of Experience in Education	16.5	14.1	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	78.1	75.1	76.1

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	17.0	17.5	18.3
Grade 2	19.9	19.0	19.3
Grade 5	21.7	20.9	21.0
Grade 7	19.7	20.7	20.5
High School	17.6	20.0	19.3

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	994	986	988
Middle School	1,065	1,026	1,016
High School	1,026	1,008	1,007

*State law requires that at least 900 hours of instruction be offered to students in grade 1-12 and full-day kindergarten, and 450 hours to half-day kindergarten students.

Students Per Academic Computer	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School*	4.0	3.7	3.3
Middle School	2.2	3.0	2.6
High School	2.2	3.0	2.4

*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2007-08

Expenditures may be supported by local tax revenues, state grants, federal grants, municipal in-kind services, tuition and other sources. DRG and state figures will not be comparable to the district if the school district does not teach both elementary and secondary students.

Expenditures All figures are unaudited.	Total (in 1000s)	Expenditures Per Pupil			
		District	PK-12 Districts	DRG	State
Instructional Staff and Services	\$17,839	\$8,475	\$7,521	\$7,079	\$7,522
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$1,127	\$535	\$267	\$266	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$756	\$359	\$461	\$372	\$446
Student Support Services	\$1,912	\$908	\$808	\$754	\$806
Administration and Support Services	\$1,959	\$931	\$1,351	\$1,261	\$1,369
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$2,280	\$1,083	\$1,382	\$1,261	\$1,377
Transportation	\$1,521	\$664	\$649	\$590	\$644
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$936	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$370	\$176	\$152	\$151	\$151
Total	\$28,702	\$13,462	\$12,869	\$12,042	\$12,805
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$870	\$413	\$1,791	\$1,047	\$1,759

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$5,785,075	20.2	20.6	20.5

Revenue Sources, % of Expenditures from Source. Revenue sources do not include state funded Teachers' Retirement Board contributions, vocational-technical school operations, SDE budgeted costs for salaries and leadership activities and other state-funded school districts (e.g., Dept. of Children and Families and Dept. of Corrections).

District Expenditures	Local Revenue	State Revenue	Federal Revenue	Tuition & Other
Including School Construction	69.5	28.1	2.4	0.0
Excluding School Construction	74.2	23.4	2.4	0.0

EQUITABLE ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES AMONG DISTRICT SCHOOLS

Below is the description submitted by this district of how it allocates resources to insure equity and address needs.

This year, given the economic constraints, the district leadership focused on maintaining core programs and minimizing the impact on the student. The basic budget process entails four critical steps; 1) open budget hearings, 2) cost center/building level budget preparation, 3) district budget development, and 4) budget presentations. Prior to developing the annual budget, the Board of Education holds a community-wide budget forum to solicit input, concerns, and priorities regarding the district programming. Following the forum, building administrators and their leadership team builds a “need driven” operational budget. The budgets are specifically designed to support building goals that in turn support district goals. Building administrators, present their budget to the central office administrators who review and clarify each proposed budget. The administrative leadership team also meets to review personnel requests and prioritize personnel needs. The superintendent then develops an overall preliminary budget for the Board of Education to review and provide feedback. Embedded in this process is an annual up-date of a ten-year plan for capital improvements that also includes funds for equipment, furniture and technology. The Board receives additional monies from both State and Federal sources to help finance remedial programs and special education programs. Federal and state funding sources are subject to fluctuations. The state has a formula for providing funding to offset cost that exceed 450% of the expenditure for a regular per student in the district. The percent of the reimbursement is subject to federal allocations and state budgets.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	262
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	12.8%

Of All K-12 Students for Whom District is Financially Responsible, Number and Percentage with Disabilities				
Disability	Count	District Percent	DRG Percent	State Percent
Autism	14	0.7	1.0	0.8
Learning Disability	115	5.6	3.3	3.9
Intellectual Disability	9	0.4	0.4	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	20	1.0	0.9	1.0
Speech Impairment	46	2.2	2.5	2.3
Other Health Impairment*	39	1.9	2.2	2.1
Other Disabilities**	19	0.9	0.9	0.9
Total	262	12.8	11.2	11.6

*Includes chronic health problems such as attention deficit disorders and epilepsy

**Includes hearing, visual, and orthopedic impairments, deaf-blindness, multiple disabilities, traumatic brain injury, and developmental delay

Graduation and Dropout Rates of Students with Disabilities for Whom District is Financially Responsible	District	State
% Who Graduated in 2007-08 with a Standard Diploma	88.2	81.4
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	N/A	3.5

STATE ASSESSMENTS

Percent of Students with Disabilities Meeting State Goal. The Goal level is more demanding than the Proficient level, but not as high as the Advanced level, reported in the No Child Left Behind Report Cards. These results are for students attending district schools who participated in the standard assessment with or without accommodations for their disabilities. Results for fewer than 20 students are not presented.

- **Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT), Fourth Generation.** The CMT reading, writing and mathematics tests are administered to students in Grades 3 through 8, and the CMT science test to students in Grades 5 and 8.
- **Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT), Third Generation.** The CAPT is administered to Grade 10 students.

State Assessment		Students with Disabilities		All Students	
		District	State	District	State
CMT	Reading	34.3	30.2	75.7	65.7
	Writing	23.3	19.5	72.6	64.1
	Mathematics	31.8	30.7	70.5	65.7
	Science	35.4	23.8	70.6	59.4
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	34.8	14.1	60.8	47.4
	Writing Across the Disciplines	25.0	13.6	66.7	55.0
	Mathematics	16.7	15.4	50.7	47.8
	Science	12.0	10.6	47.9	42.8

For more detailed CMT or CAPT results, go to www.ctreports.com. To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on “No Child Left Behind.”

Participation in State Assessments of Students with Disabilities Attending District Schools		
CMT	% Without Accommodations	8.8
	% With Accommodations	91.2
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	11.5
	% With Accommodations	88.5
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		6.9

Accommodations for a student’s disability may be made to allow him or her to participate in testing. Students whose disabilities prevent them from taking the test even with accommodations are assessed by means of a list of skills aligned to the same content and grade level standards as the CMT and CAPT.

Federal law requires that students with disabilities be educated with their non-disabled peers as much as is appropriate. Placement in separate educational facilities tends to reduce the chances of students with disabilities interacting with non-disabled peers, and of receiving the same education.

K-12 Students with Disabilities Placed in Educational Settings Other Than This District’s Schools		
Placement	Count	Percent
Public Schools in Other Districts	0	0.0
Private Schools or Other Settings	9	3.4

Number and Percentage of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom District is Financially Responsible by the Percentage of Time They Spent with Their Non-Disabled Peers				
Time Spent with Non-Disabled Peers	Count of Students	Percent of Students		
		District	DRG	State
79.1 to 100 Percent of Time	181	69.1	75.5	72.7
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	61	23.3	15.2	16.1
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	20	7.6	9.3	11.2

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

(General Improvement Initiatives)

The focus for 2000-09 was the implementation of the professional learning communities as a mechanism for collaborative and systemic improvement. Basic concepts of the professional learning communities' model were utilized at the district level to reorganize; K-12 curriculum renewal teams, the district-wide response to intervention (RTI) research and development committee, and the administrative council; and introduced at the building level to guide professional development and professional growth plans. In addition to major curriculum renewal in language arts, math and social studies, a district-wide action team developed a model for its Scientifically Researched-based Intervention (SRBI) plan. The district-wide team created an action plan for each of the grade level teams (K-5, 6-8, and 9-12) to use as a framework for developing key elements of the plan. At the end of the year each reported its findings and presented its model. The district-wide team then consolidated the plans to insure continuity K-12. Plans were initially presented to district staff in the spring with the goal of piloting and refining the district model in 2009-10. The district continues to support teachers involved in the Columbia Writer's project. The High School of the Future Task force completed its eight-month study of 21st century learning expectations and reported on the impact of those findings on existing educational programming and facility capacity. The Task Force prepared an action and implementation plan with specific expectations and evidence of success for the 2009-10 school year, as well as, for 2009 through 2012, and for 2011 through 2014. The High School of the Future initiative reinforces the school's preparation for a 2010 accreditation visit. Implications of this research project are already being considered throughout the district as we engage in conversations about the qualities and characteristics of a Clinton Graduate and the ways each level supports and cultivates independent and collaborative learners.

(Special Education Services)

CPS continued its focus on supporting the inclusion of students with disabilities with their non-disabled peers. Training in differentiated instruction and reading intervention programs was a primary focus for expanding the skill set for the special education staff in their efforts to support students in the classroom and provide teachers with additional intervention strategies. Work on developing universal screens and common assessments to assess and monitor student progress remained a critical focus for each level. In addition, each level investigated and piloted interventions strategies for students not meeting success with the district curriculum. Programs ranged from an early literacy program for ELL students and families, to the Morning Blast at the middle school, to a math-science pilot program for 9th graders. A team of high school teachers who had been trained in CRISS provided in-service for their peers. A team of special education teachers and the special education director were trained in providing a series of training modules for our paraprofessionals. The team will be providing specific training in general classroom management and instructional strategies, and workshops on specific learning challenges for student on the autism spectrum.

(Engaging Parents)

The district continues its efforts to engage parents in supporting school improvement including: the superintendent and assistant superintendent search processes; parent organizations, "friends of" groups and PTA; the High School of the Future Task Force; and Principal Hours. Participation in forums suggests a high level of interest. The Joel Elementary School wrote and received a second Family Learning Connection grant that was designed to work with parents and first grade students on developing home support for reading. The literacy staff conducted a series of afternoon and evening events to teach parents what they can do to support their children at home followed by time for parent to practice the techniques with guidance from the literacy staff.
